

FERENCE & ASSOCIATES LLC

409 Broad Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15143
Phone: (412) 741-8400
Fax: (412) 741-9292
Web: www.ferencelaw.com

USPTO FACSIMILE COVER SHEET

To: Commissioner for Patents
Fax Number: 571-273-3699
Date: February 28, 2008
Pages: 2 pages (including this cover sheet)

MESSAGE:**VARIATIONAL MODELING USING EXTENSION TYPES**

Application Serial No. 10/676,952

Examiner Eric B. Kiss

Art Unit 2129

Informal Communication—Interview Agenda

YOR920030353US1

(590.113)

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS COMMUNICATION IS CONFIDENTIAL, MAY BE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED, MAY CONSTITUTE INSIDE INFORMATION, AND IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE ADDRESSEE. UNAUTHORIZED USE, DISCLOSURE, OR COPYING IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED AND MAY BE UNLAWFUL.

IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR,
PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US ON (412) 741-8400.

INFORMAL COMMUNICATION

VARIATIONAL MODELING USING EXTENSION TYPES

Appln. Serial No. 10/676,952

(Atty. Docket No. YOR920030353US1(590.113))

Interview Agenda

Interview Date:	To Be Determined
Interview Time:	To Be Determined
Confirmed Participants:	Eric Kiss—Examiner Stanley Ference – Attorney Andrew Gabriel – Law Clerk
Posture of Case:	Final Office Action. The last office action was a final Office Action issued by Examiner Kiss.
Status of Claims:	Claims 1-21 are pending. Claims 1-21 stand rejected. Claims 1, 11 and 21 are independent; the remaining claims are dependent. Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 USC § 101.
Topic:	In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants would like to address the following in the interview. First, Applicants would like to briefly address the Information Disclosure Statement to ensure that there is a common understanding as to which references have been considered by the Examiner. Second, Applicants would like to briefly address the specification (i.e. use of trademarks) in order to resolve outstanding issues. Finally, Applicants would like to discuss the § 101 rejections to ensure a common understanding of the rejections and, if necessary, discuss amendments that may be utilized to obviate these rejections (e.g. incorporating language to ensure a “useful, tangible and concrete result”, etc.). Applicants believe that since amendments addressing these issues had been previously submitted and were not deemed satisfactory by the Examiner, rather than submitting proposed amendments, it would be more helpful to have a discussion regarding the “gist” of the invention (i.e. providing the extension types for variational modeling to help simplify many concepts in AOSD and design patterns) and receive the benefit of the Examiner’s thinking as to what claim language would be statutory.